

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Final Office Action mailed on July 29, 2005, and the references cited therewith. Claims 1, 3, 13, and 16 are amended, claim 2 is canceled, and no claims are added; as a result, claims 1 and 3-22 are now pending in this application.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-3, 6-9, and 12-22 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murphy (U.S. Patent No. 5,305,195) in view of Wolff (U.S. Patent No. 6,209,048).

Applicant submits that neither the Murphy reference nor the Wolff reference, either independently or in combination, describe, teach, or suggest each and every element in independent claims 1, 13, or 16, as amended. The Murphy reference appears to describe a system for imposing advertising messages on users of remote terminals associated with on-line terminals. (Col. 1, lines 5-8). In column 3, lines 29-40, Murphy recites:

The student selects an appropriate terminal, inserts his card and PIN number and is ready to access the school mainframe to complete his registration. Once the student is properly identified by the campus mainframe, all available options are available and they include by way of example, class selection, residence selection, book selection, course screening, grades, campus information, scholarships/student loans, jobs/work study, classified ads and even payment capability are including together with any other information that the school feels the student should have access to in order for him to complete his registration.

In Wolff, the summary of the invention states:

The peripheral is operable with a network that provides access to interconnected, on-line documents. The access occurs in response to document requests. The peripheral includes a server that controls peripheral operations using requests formatted as a resource locator (e.g., an http request). (Col. 3, lines 1-8).

Neither the Murphy reference nor the Wolff reference, either independently or in combination, describe, teach, or suggest a peripheral device that allows local users to share control of the peripheral device, where the peripheral device has a content delivery device including a display screen operable to display a device status

of the peripheral device and operable to deliver electronic content information to the display screen that is unrelated to the device status of the peripheral device.

In contrast, Applicant's independent claims 1 and 13, as amended, each recite in part:

a software module operable to allow a number of local users to share control of the peripheral device through requests to perform a task received from other devices coupled to the network;

a content delivery device including a display screen operable to display a device status of the peripheral device and operable to deliver electronic content information to the display screen that is unrelated to the device status.

Applicant's independent claim 16, as amended, recites in part:

providing shared control of the peripheral device to a number of local users through a computer communication network;

receiving a request to perform a task from a local user through another device coupled to the network;

displaying a device status of the peripheral device on a content delivery device including a display screen coupled to the peripheral device;

retrieving electronic content information to the display screen that is unrelated to the device status of the peripheral device.

As such, Applicant respectfully submits that each and every element and limitation as contained in independent claims 1, 13, and 16, as amended, is neither described, taught, or suggested in the Murphy and Wolff references, either independently or in combination. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 103 rejection for independent claims 1, 13, and 16, and the claims that depend therefrom.

Claims 4 and 5 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murphy (U.S. Patent No. 5,305,195) in view of Wolff (U.S. Patent No. 6,209,048), as applied above, further in view of Cohen (U.S. Patent No. 6,076,094).

Claims 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murphy (U.S. Patent No. 5,305,195) in view of Wolff (U.S. Patent No. 6,209,048), as applied above, further in view of Plasson (U.S. Patent No. 6,795,688).

From the Applicant's review of the Cohen and Plasson references, the references do not cure the above noted deficiencies of the Murphy and Wolff references as applied to independent claims 1, 13, and 16. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 4, 5, 10, and 11 since they depend from independent claim 1, which is in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney Gregg W. Wisdom at (360) 212-8052.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to the Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR §1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS AF Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 27th day of September, 2005.

Sarah L Reinhard
Name

Sarah L. Reinhard
Signature

Respectfully Submitted,
Jay Carstens, et al.

By their Representatives,

BROOKS & CAMERON, PLLC
1221 Nicollet Avenue, Suite 500
Minneapolis, MN 55403

By:

Edward J. Brooks III
Reg. No. 40,925

Date:

9/27/2005